

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 - 8, 11, 12, 14 and 18 - 20 are pending for consideration in the present application. Claims 2, 9, 10, 13, 15 - 17 and 21 - 27 are canceled, wherein claims 22 - 24 are being canceled by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 3 - 8, 11, 12, 14, 18 - 20 and 22 - 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153663 to Clark et al. (hereinafter "the Clark et al. publication"), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0033553 to Monteverde (hereinafter "the Monteverde publication"), in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0136381 to Shaffer et al. (hereinafter "the Shaffer et al. publication"). Claims 1, 12 and 20 are independent claims. Applicants are clarifying an aspect of each of claims 1, 12 and 20 that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited combination of the Clark et al. publication, the Montverde publication and the Shaffer et al. publication.

Claim 1 provides for a method for data cleansing. The method includes:

- receiving an input postal address and a DUNS number;
- comparing the input postal address to a standard;
- providing a single best postal address derived from the input postal address, based on the comparison;
- matching a DUNS number and the single best postal address to a database having DUNS numbers associated with postal addresses, to find a matching postal address in the database;
- and
- correcting the input postal address based on the matching postal address.

Note that in the method of claim 1, (i) the single best postal address is provided, and thereafter, (ii) the DUNS number and the single best address are matched to the database having DUNS numbers associated with postal addresses, to find a matching postal address in the database. The application describes this aspect of the method in FIG. 2, steps 21 and 214.

The Clark et al. publication is directed to detecting fraud and assisting in fraud prevention due to identity theft including to but not limited to address change, account takeover fraud, and new account application fraud (par. 0002). The Office Action, on page 2, recognizes that the Clark et al. publication does not teach providing a single best address. Thus, the Office Action looks to the Monteverde publication.

The Monteverde publication is directed to generating and retrieving relevant search results based upon an initial search query utilizing a conventional Internet search engine (par. 0001). However, the Monteverde publication does not mention a postal address, and therefore does not disclose providing a **single best postal address** derived from the input postal address, as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action, on page 3, recognizes that neither of the Clark et al. publication nor the Monteverde publication teaches matching a unique business identifier and the single best postal address to a database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses, to find a matching address for correction of an input address. Thus, the Office Action looks to the Shaffer et al. publication.

The Shaffer et al. publication is directed to processing of a vanity telephone number dialed by a caller with a conventional telephone, so as to access a national virtual telephone number database (par. 0003). The Shaffer et al. publication mentions a DUNS number, for example, for linking into the DUNS database for credit information (par. 0104 and 0138), and to obtain names of corporate officers and credit history information (par. 0229). However, the Shaffer et al. publication does not disclose matching a DUNS number and the single best postal address to a database having DUNS numbers associated with postal addresses, **to find a matching postal address in the database, and correcting the input postal address** based on the matching postal address, as recited in claim 1.

Thus, the cited combination of the Clark et al. publication, the Montverde publication and the Shaffer et al. publication neither discloses nor suggests all of the elements of claim 1.

Moreover, as noted above:

- (a) the Clark et al. publication is directed to detecting fraud and assisting in fraud prevention due to identity theft including to but not limited to address change, account takeover fraud, and new account application fraud,
- (b) the Monteverde publication is directed to generating and retrieving relevant search results based upon an initial search query utilizing a conventional Internet search engine, and
- (c) the Shaffer et al. publication is directed to processing of a vanity telephone number dialed by a caller with a conventional telephone, so as to access a national virtual telephone number database.

Each the references is specifically directed to (a) something different than the other two references, and (b) something other than correcting a postal address. Applicants are therefore submitting that there is no motive to combine the teachings of these references for **correcting a postal address**, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants are submitting that for the several reasons provided above, claim 1 is not obvious in view of, but is instead patentable over, the cited combination of the Clark et al. publication, the Montverde publication and the Shaffer et al. publication.

Claims 12 and 20 are independent claims. Each of claims 12 and 20 includes a recital similar to that of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 12 and 20, similarly to claim 1, are patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 3 - 8 and 11 depend from claim 1. Claims 14, 18 and 19 depend from claim 12. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 3 - 8, 11, 14, 18 and 19 are also patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 22 - 24 are canceled. As such, the rejection thereof is rendered moot.

Applicants are requesting reconsideration and a withdrawal of the section 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 3 - 8, 11, 12, 14, 18 - 20 and 22 - 24.


As mentioned above, Applicants are clarifying an aspect of each of claims 1, 12 and 20 that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited combination of the Clark et al. publication, the Montverde publication and the Shaffer et al. publication. Additionally, Applicants are amending claims 5 - 7, 11, 19 for consistency with the claims from which they depend, and amending claims 12 and 14 to improve their form.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

11/10/09


Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for the Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: 203-327-4500
Fax: 203-327-6401